



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2021

by **C Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2021

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/21/3267119**

**6, Cadeby Road, Sprotbrough, Doncaster, DN5 7SD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Jason Mace against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 20/02052/FUL, dated 28 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as erection of single storey detached garage, wall, railings, gates and trees to front of dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey detached garage, wall, railings and gates at 6, Cadeby Road, Sprotbrough, Doncaster, DN5 7SD, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02052/FUL, dated 28 July 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
  - 2) The development must be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
    - Drawing no. 20016 01 (Site Location and Proposed Block Plan);
    - Drawing no. 20016 02 (Proposed Site Plan);
    - Drawing no. 20016 03 (Proposed Floor Plans);
    - Drawing no. 20016 04 (Proposed Elevations); and
    - Drawing no. 20016 05 (Proposed Street Scene).
  - 3) Before the development is brought into use, that part of the site to be used by vehicles shall be surfaced and drained in a manner to be approved in writing by the local planning authority.
  - 4) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a crossing over the footpath has been constructed in accordance with a scheme previously approved in writing by the local planning authority.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a large detached dwelling which was under construction at the time of my site visit. Located within a predominantly residential area, the appeal site fronts directly onto a main pedestrian and vehicular route through Sprotbrough. To one side are other residential dwellings and to the other the Sprotbrough Country Club.
4. The appeal site does not relate to any designated features or areas that would be particularly sensitive to change, albeit its road frontage positioning gives it a presence in the street scene.
5. The defining consistent characteristics of this street scene are dwellings which are set a good distance from the highway. Those, which like the appeal dwelling, front onto the highway tend to share a consistent building line. Whilst front gardens are physically contained, they are free from high boundary enclosures.
6. However, the Club building breaks with the consistency found on this side of the road, being situated hard against the back of the public foot way and its grounds defined by a higher enclosure. Furthermore, those dwellings on the other side which back onto Cadeby Road tend to be contained by high boundary enclosures. This all forms part of the street scene.
7. The height and positioning of the proposed boundary wall would not be dissimilar to those front garden enclosures found along this part of Cadeby Road. The finished height of the gates, piers and railings would not be dissimilar to the Club's boundary treatment, or that on the other side of the road.
8. Furthermore, the gates and railings would afford views through, thus lessening the visual effect of the overall finished height. Given their scale relative to one another, the proposed boundary enclosure would remain subservient to the host dwelling. They would also match in style and materials to the host.
9. For these reasons, the proposed boundary enclosure would not be incongruous or dominant within the street scene.
10. The proposed detached garage would reflect the style and materials of the host dwelling. Given its hipped roof design, coupled with the large scale of the host dwelling, the appeal proposal would be subservient to it. Furthermore, the proposed intervening boundary treatment would serve to break up the bulk of the proposed garage when viewed from the street.
11. However, the proposed garage would occupy a position forward of the prevailing building line which characterises this part of the street. Consequently, it would be visible in the street scene on approach into Sprotbrough. Nonetheless, it would be read with the existing dwellings and also the bulk of the Club building. Furthermore, when travelling out of Sprotbrough the visibility of the proposed garage would be largely screened by the Club building until a point very close to the appeal site, from where it would be read with the mass of the host dwelling.
12. Indeed, the appeal proposal would change the appearance of the street scene. However, as the appellant's evidence demonstrates, that proposed change

- would not lead to an overly dominating or incongruous development which would represent an unexpected, alien feature.
13. The Council's concern about the success and longevity of the proposed planting scheme is justified. However, the absence of this planting here would not alter my findings.
  14. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.
  15. Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 of the Framework states that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, while not preventing or discouraging change, amongst other things.
  16. The Council's Development Guidance and Requirements Supplementary Planning Document states that householder development will be supported which complement and enhance existing buildings and their settings and avoid negative impacts on the quality of the local environment. This policy sets out a number of principles to achieve this. Amongst other things, this includes the design concept, layout and detailing taking reference from the host dwelling, neighbouring properties and the character of the area. Development should be subservient to its host.
  17. In the absence of harm, the appeal proposal does not conflict with either the Framework or this local planning guidance.
  18. Policy S1 of the emerging Sprotbrough Neighbourhood Development Plan states, amongst other things, that developments should enhance and reinforce the local distinctiveness of the area. Care should be taken to ensure that buildings do not disrupt the visual amenity of the street scene.
  19. Moreover, Policy ENV54 of the adopted Doncaster Unitary Development Plan states that alterations and extensions to existing buildings should be sympathetic in scale, materials, layout and general design to the existing building.
  20. Policy CS1 and Policy CS14 of the adopted Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 require development to be of a high quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness, integrates well with its immediate surroundings and makes a positive contribution to the character of the area.
  21. In the absence of harm to the host building and the character and appearance of the wider area, there is no conflict with these policies.

### **Conditions**

22. In addition to a condition limiting the timescale for the proposed development to be implemented, a condition requiring the development to be implemented in accordance with the approved plans is necessary, in the interests of certainty.
23. A condition to manage the surfacing and disposal of surface water is necessary so as to avoid any road hazards. A condition to manage the design of the proposed access is necessary in the interests of safety of users of the highway.

24. As the plans clearly specify that materials will match the existing dwelling a condition to manage materials is unnecessary in this instance. In the absence of harm and given the Council's concern about the longevity of the proposed planting scheme a landscaping condition is also unnecessary, and the description of development amended accordingly.

**Conclusion**

25. For the reasons given, there is no conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. No matters have been advanced that out-weigh this finding. Consequently, the appeal should be allowed, subject to the prescribed conditions.

*C Dillon*

INSPECTOR